Downloaded from: justpaste.it/Kristyn-Alcott

Alcott’s Soft-Core “Daddy’s Girl” Selfie Captures Chaos Inside Arizona’s Family Courts

Maricopa County, AZ—January 13, 2026 –”*Daddy’s Girl*” Scandal Explodes: Arizona Family Courts Let Disgraced Supervisor Kristyn Alcott Keep Working Amid Credible Allegations of Perjury, Impersonation, Fraud, and Child Endangerment.

Maricopa County parenting-time supervisor Kristyn Alcott is facing another wave of public backlash after posting a selfie that many parents say looks more like an adult-entertainment promotion than the image of someone entrusted with supervising vulnerable children.

In the photo, Alcott pulls down her lower lip to display a fresh "*Daddy's Girl*" tattoo, a choice that parents describe as disturbing, inappropriate, and impossible to separate from the high-conflict custody cases she oversees. Her revealing outfit and provocative pose resemble adult-entertainment aesthetics far more than the demeanor expected from someone monitoring children during sensitive therapeutic visits. For families already navigating emotionally charged disputes, the image has become a symbol of what they view as deeply compromised judgment from a court appointed professional.

Families who have been assigned to Alcott say the phrase "*Daddy's Girl*" reads like a personal allegiance, one that undermines any expectation of impartiality when she is evaluating the behavior of fathers during supervised visitation. Those concerns are amplified by public records from her own divorce, where her father testified against her, adding a troubling emotional foundation to the tattoo's meaning. To parents, the image suggests a paternal fixation commonly associated with "*daddy issues*" and such symbolism is impossible to ignore in cases involving allegations of abuse, coercive control, or alienation. Together, the image and her personal history create the appearance of a supervisor whose unresolved paternal issues may influence her recommendations in cases where fathers are accused of misconduct.

A PATTERN OF ESCALATING CONCERNS

The tattoo scandal is only the latest in a long series of controversies surrounding Alcott. Over the past several years, she has been accused by parents, attorneys, and advocates of:

- Misrepresentation of credentials and impersonation of a social worker.
- Providing services without proper licensure.
- Submitting reports that parents say minimized, mischaracterized, and even covered up abuse.
- Recommending reunification between children and parents accused of serious misconduct including domestic violence, child abuse and sexual abuse.
- Switching between multiple court-appointed roles without qualifications or oversight.
- Participating in activities and billing practices amounting to consumer fraud, honest services fraud, Title IV-D fraud, and allegedly participating in a patient brokering scheme.
- Submitting false reports to the court or providing dishonest testimony under oath.

MISREPRESENTATION AND UNLICENSED PRACTICE

Parents report that Alcott has repeatedly misrepresented her background, presenting herself as a social worker or similarly credentialed professional despite not holding the licenses typically required for those roles. According to these families, she has still been appointed in sensitive positions such as therapeutic interventionist, Rule 81 supervisor, parenting coordinator, social worker, and investigator, even though each of these roles usually carries distinct training, licensing, and ethical requirements. In case after case courts allowed her to shift titles and responsibilities without verifying whether she actually met the standards those appointments presuppose.

Kristyn Alcott and Family First Forensic Consultants have been listed on the Maricopa County government website as a "*Parental Social Worker,*" despite Alcott lacking the qualifications or credentials required for that title. A review of multiple service contracts between Alcott and parents also shows that she has signed her name using various professional designations, including "*BSW*" and "*Social Worker.*" For years, Alcott submitted reports to the court under penalty of perjury using those same titles, and she signed emails to attorneys and other court-appointed professionals with designations including "*BSW*," "*Social Worker*," and "*MS*." Families also report that she misrepresented her qualifications to schools, medical providers, and the Department of Child Safety, further reinforcing concerns that she repeatedly portrayed herself as a licensed professional in settings where credential integrity are legally and ethically required.

Taken directly from Kristyn Alcott's testimony in front of the Joint Legislative Ad Hoc Committee on Family Court Orders:

> ***SENATOR FINCHEM:***
> *"*Do you work for an agency or the state?*"*

> ***KRISTYN ALCOTT:***
> *"*I work independently. I do have a contract with the state and juvenile court to provide parent social worker services, but I do not work directly for the state.*"*

> ***SENATOR FINCHEM:***
> *"*So it's accurate to say TIs mostly work independently?*"*

> ***KRISTYN ALCOTT:***
> *“*Yes.*”*

> ***SENATOR FINCHEM:***
> *“*Is it fee-for-service?*”*

> ***KRISTYN ALCOTT:***
> *“*Speaking for myself only, I offer a sliding scale if the court finds a party indigent. I am currently finishing my master’s degree, so I am not personally doing TI work. I run a supervision agency and do Rule 81 work—case implementation supervision. I oversee compliance with court orders and do not make recommendations.*”*

> *“*TI rates generally range from $150 to $400 per hour.*”*

> ***REPRESENTATIVE KESHEL:***
> *“*Ms. Alcott, are you a licensed TI?*”*

> ***KRISTYN ALCOTT:***
> *“*No. I do not provide TI services. I am finishing my master’s degree. I work under a licensed provider and can provide reduced-rate services under their supervision, but I do not personally perform TI work*.”*

The transcript makes the contradiction unmistakable. Alcott’s sworn testimony stands in direct conflict with the reports she files under penalty of perjury in custody cases, where she clearly offers recommendations to the court and performs services that fall outside the scope of what an unlicensed individual is permitted to do.

Despite the viral backlash from her perjured testimony before Arizona’s Ad Hoc Committee on Family Court Orders, Kristyn Alcott brazenly doubled down on her fraudulent practices. She secured fresh Maricopa Superior Court appointments, submitted false reports defying legislative scrutiny, and advertised unauthorized services online—including Individual and Family Therapy, Rule 81 evaluations, CAA, and C.O.B.I.—despite lacking qualifications and testifying to senators that she performs no Therapeutic Intervention work and does not make recommendations to the court.

REPORTS THAT MINIMIZE OR DISTORT ABUSE

Many complaints focus on the content of Alcott's written reports, which parents say downplay or ignore evidence of serious harm. They allege that her documentation has minimized, mischaracterized, or even concealed reports of domestic violence, child abuse, and sexual misconduct. In some matters, families claim her recommendations pushed for reunification between children and parents who had been accused of significant abuse, raising grave questions about her judgment and about the safeguards that should exist when supervisors influence custody outcomes.

FINANCIAL MISCONDUCT AND RETALIATION CLAIMS

In addition to clinical and ethical concerns, families describe a range of financial issues, including questionable billing practices and activities they believe amount to consumer fraud, honest-services fraud, Title IV-D fraud, and participation in patient-brokering schemes. When parents challenge her invoices, qualifications, or courtroom conduct, they experience retaliation rather than meaningful review. Reported consequences include less time with their children, sanctions, expanded court involvement, and orders for additional services that they must pay for, increasing both emotional and financial strain. Even when Alcott is removed from a case, families say the fallout often triggers new evaluations, hearings, and interventions, effectively multiplying the costs of speaking up while losing precious time with their children.

ONLINE SELF PROMOTION AND DECEPTION

Online self-promotion has also become a significant point of concern in Alcott's pattern of misrepresentation. It appears she authored her own five-star reviews for **Family First Forensic Consultants** on platforms such as Bizapedia and Yelp, and that her Google business page was removed entirely after a wave of negative feedback In several of the positive reviews attributed to her, Alcott is said to have described herself as an "*amazing professional*" while posing as a satisfied client—without disclosing that she was the business owner.

This type of undisclosed self-endorsement is widely recognized as deceptive marketing and may violate both Arizona's consumer-fraud statutes and Federal Trade Commission (FTC) rules governing false or misleading endorsements, which require reviewers to disclose any financial or personal connection to the business. Parents argue that these fabricated

testimonials misled families into trusting a provider they might have viewed far more critically had they known the true source of the testimonials.

SYSTEMIC IMPACT ON FAMILIES AND THE COURTS

Taken together, these allegations form a consistent pattern that, in the eyes of many families, exposes serious weaknesses in Arizona's family court oversight or lack thereof. Parents and advocates question how one individual could be repeatedly appointed to powerful roles without clear licensure, face recurring complaints about misrepresentation and abuse minimization, and still remain embedded in cases that shape children's lives. Reported retaliation against those who raise concerns, combined with aggressive self-promotion and disputed billing, has turned what should be a protective court function into a source of ongoing harm. For these families, the issue is no longer just one professional's conduct but the judiciary's continued reliance on her despite years of documented objections.

Even more troubling is that, when litigants appealed their cases, the Arizona Court of Appeals repeatedly concluded that *"the Superior Court did not abuse its discretion by relying on Kristyn Alcott's testimony."* This deference came despite the fact that Alcott publicly gave false statements in a Senate hearing and had misrepresented her credentials for years—including listing herself with Maricopa County as a "*Parental Social Worker*," a title she does not hold and for which she lacks the required qualifications. Under Arizona's professional-licensure laws, it is prohibited to represent oneself as a licensed professional or to use a protected title without holding the appropriate state license, making her use of the social-worker designation a crime.

ALCOTT'S AUDACIOUS TESTIMONY DRAWS NATIONAL ATTENTION

Alcott's appearance before the **Arizona Ad Hoc Committee on Family Court Orders** in 2025 became an inflection point in the state's long-running dispute over family-court accountability. What was expected to be a standard legislative proceeding rapidly transformed into a widely viewed public flashpoint, as her testimony—streamed in real time and swiftly amplified across digital platforms—invited intense scrutiny.

Observers pointed out clear inconsistencies between Alcott's testimony and her documented history, igniting a wider discussion about the credibility and power of the professionals who operate within Arizona's Family Courts. Within days, what began as a narrow, Arizona-specific

concern had escalated into a topic of national reporting and legislative scrutiny, drawing attention from journalists, lawmakers, and advocacy groups across the country.

The repercussions of her testimony extended well beyond her personal conduct or circumstances. By speaking openly, Alcott highlighted long-standing concerns about a tightly knit closed loop referral network of evaluators, supervisors, and attorneys who routinely appear before the same judicial officers and wield considerable sway over custody determinations. Families voiced apprehensions about this closed ecosystem for years, though those warnings rarely escaped the confines of individual courtrooms. Her testimony disrupted that pattern. It compelled a broader investigation into the system's internal dynamics, drawing renewed attention from legislators, reporters, and advocacy groups that had previously struggled to gain visibility. What had once circulated quietly among affected parents suddenly entered national spotlight, intensifying pressure on state officials to address persistent questions surrounding transparency, accountability, and oversight in Arizona's Family Courts.

Observers noted that Kristyn Alcott sat beside **Dr. Daniel J. Gaughan, Ph.D.**, a prominent figure in Arizona's forensic psychology community, immediately before delivering her testimony.

In June 2025, Dr. Gaughan received a Non-disciplinary Letter of Concern that detailed, among other things, his failure to recuse from a custody case where he agreed to serve as a court-ordered supervising family therapist for a contentious family court case involving a party for whom Dr. Gaughan issued a "*Professional Consultation*" report approximately three months prior to his appointment by the court. Dr. Gaughan elected not to recuse from the case despite the opposing party's objection and concern that his involvement as the supervising therapist was a conflict of interest. The letter also detailed Dr. Gaughan's questionable billing practices, noting that selective billing—for which clients are charged different amounts (or not at all) for the same service—is problematic for a number of reasons.

The letter goes on to state that if the conduct is not corrected, it may constitute a violation of Arizona Revised Statutes §32–2061(16)(dd), violating an ethical standard adopted by the Board as it pertains to the following sections of the American Psychological Association's ethics code: 3.05 (Multiple Relationships), 3.06 (Conflicts of Interest), and 6.04 (Fees and Financial Arrangements).

A follow-up article will detail his affiliation in the close-knit network of "*professionals*" who frequently appear together in Arizona Family Court cases.

A PUBLIC DEFENSE OF "ALIENATION" THAT COLLIDES WITH HER OWN FAMILY SITUATION

During her testimony before the Ad Hoc Committee, Alcott presented herself as someone deeply familiar with parental alienation and its psychological impact on children. Responding to questions from Committee Chairman Senator Mark Finchem, she described alienation as a form of emotional abuse, insisted it is addressed within the DSM, and emphasized the importance of Therapeutic Intervention in repairing damaged parent-child relationships.

Specifically, Alcott stated:

> ***"Parental alienation falls under child abuse. It is addressed within the DSM. The term itself is often a buzzword, but at its core it refers to psychological and emotional abuse, which are defined within the DSM."***

Then she shifted into a personal narrative that drew immediate attention:

> ***"On a personal note, my own family is currently navigating a high-conflict dynamic and has been involved in litigation for ten years. Like many parents in this situation, I have a child who is struggling with the impact of prolonged litigation and division. Without structured, neutral support such as TI, I fear the damage will deepen—not only to relationships but to my child's sense of stability and safety. TI could provide a healthier path forward. Without it, families like mine are left with litigation alone, and courtrooms are not where children heal."***

The statement was intended to illustrate the need for TI. Instead, it triggered a wave of scrutiny.
Alcott has never had a TI provider on her own case, nor has she requested one at any point during more than a decade of litigation. This contradiction—publicly promoting TI as essential while never using it in her own family—undermines the credibility of her testimony.

The stark contrast between her testimony and her personal case raises concerns about whether she applies the same standards to herself that she promotes in courtrooms. **If a supervisor publicly condemns alienation while her own child has gone months without seeing their father it creates the appearance of a double standard that is impossible to ignore.**

For families who have been subject to Alcott's authority, the contradiction feels especially troubling. It is difficult to accept her assessments of other parents' behavior when questions have been raised about her own family dynamics and parental fitness. The issue is emblematic of a broader problem within Arizona's family court system, where professionals wield significant power with limited oversight.

Alcott's testimony, intended to bolster the case for TI, instead opened a window into her own family circumstances—and critics say that window revealed contradictions the system can no longer ignore.

KRISTYN ALCOTT'S DECADE-LONG DIVORCE: A TRAIL OF FRAUD, ALIENATION, AND HYPOCRISY

As public scrutiny over Kristyn Alcott's professional conduct intensified, attention shifted to troubling allegations involving her own parental fitness that raise fundamental questions about

her judgment, credibility, and suitability to serve as a court-appointed supervisor in child-custody cases.

While Alcott lectures Arizona families on child-welfare standards, her own decade-long divorce record reflects allegations of financial misconduct, parental alienation, child neglect, and repeated law-enforcement involvement—issues that would jeopardize Legal Decision-Making or Parenting Time for any ordinary parent.

A CASE THAT NEVER ENDS

Long before Kristyn Alcott became a controversial figure in Arizona's family court system, her own custody case revealed patterns that are now impossible to ignore. Alcott initially accused the children's father of abuse—allegations that were quickly found unsubstantiated. With no findings supporting her claims, the court ordered 50/50 legal decision-making and equal parenting time, reflecting the judge's conclusion that both parents were fit to share responsibility. For years, the arrangement remained stable and the children spent meaningful time with both parents. That equilibrium began to shift, however, as Alcott's professional involvement in the family-court arena expanded and her unscrupulous litigation tactics aggressively intensified.

FROM EQUAL PARENTING TIME TO RESTRICTING FATHER ACCESS

Court records show that what began as a straightforward shared-parenting arrangement between Kristyn Alcott and the father of her children eventually devolved into years of post-decree litigation. Dockets reflect a steady stream of motions to modify parenting time, disputes over school placement, child-support challenges, and frivolous appeals. These filings created a decades-long cycle of turmoil, with repeated petitions aimed at reducing the father's access and increasing financial obligations. Appellate rulings upheld limits on her control, like school choices tied to equal-distance rules. Despite this, records indicate that Alcott continued to raise new unfounded allegations over the years, a pattern served to deflect scrutiny from concerns about her own parenting and the conditions in her home. It appears Alcott is still weaponizing the courts, limiting the children from meaningful contact with their father while not in compliance with court orders herself.

The children's father has consistently sought increased parenting time and more frequent contact with their children. There are no court findings of abuse, neglect, or safety risks that would justify restricting his access, yet the parenting arrangement has steadily eroded.

According to court records, one of the children sees their father only every other weekend, while the other reportedly has not seen him in many months. This dramatic reduction in contact stands in stark contrast to Alcott's public testimony before lawmakers, where she has repeatedly insisted that parental alienation is a form of "*child abuse*" and that children should maintain strong, consistent relationships with both parents. This case highlights the glaring double standard in Arizona's family court system that continues to appoint her to sensitive custody cases despite the turmoil and controversy that follow her.

LAW ENFORCEMENT CONTACT, HOUSEHOLD INSTABILITY, AND CHILD WELFARE CONCERNS

Law-enforcement records show repeated activity involving men at nearly every address where Alcott lived with her children. These contacts document disturbances, welfare checks, and domestic-related calls that raise serious questions about household stability and the environment the children are exposed to.

Another incident described in police reports occurred during a parenting-time exchange, where video of the encounter circulated online and appeared to show Alcott physically assaulting her child before calling law enforcement and insisting he be arrested after refusing to go with her during her parenting time. Involving police in a visitation dispute—especially one involving a minor in visible distress resisting contact—demonstrates a striking lack of trauma-informed practice and raises serious concerns about her judgment. If Alcott cannot navigate conflict or communication with her own children without escalating to law enforcement, it calls into question her suitability to supervise or evaluate anyone else's parenting time.

Police records indicate that one of Alcott's children was allegedly sexually assaulted by an individual residing in her home during her parenting time. The incident, which reportedly occurred inside Alcott's residence, highlights a stark contrast between her public claims of expertise in child safety and the conditions within her own household. Records further show that Alcott did not inform the child's father, instead concealing the incident and later minimizing its seriousness once he learned of it independently.

Law-enforcement records also indicate that Alcott left her 13-year-old daughter overnight on multiple occasions at the home of Attorney Rick Kilfoy, including in the period following the alleged sexual assault involving another individual residing in Alcott's residence.

Additional allegations have also emerged from private investigators hired in unrelated proceedings. Their reports assert that Alcott frequently leaves her children unattended for extended periods while she spends nights out dancing at bars or travelling without them.

MENTAL HEALTH PLACEMENT AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST CONCERNS

Alcott placed one of her children in a mental-health facility. Court records show she intentionally placed her child into an out-of-network facility where she is known to have professional connections. Parents and advocates say the decision raises significant questions about whether the placement was clinically necessary or whether it reflects a broader pattern of questionable judgment. These concerns are further intensified by allegations from parents in other cases who claim Alcott has engaged in what they describe as "*patient brokering*"—steering families toward specific treatment programs or facilities in ways that may financially benefit the providers involved.

For parents who have lived under Alcott's authority, the allegations involving her own household underscore what they see as a stark and troubling double standard. They point out that if any ordinary parent had comparable incidents documented in their record, they would likely face immediate investigation, heightened supervision, or even a loss of parenting time. Yet Alcott continues to secure court appointments, shape custody outcomes, and operate with a degree of institutional protection and leniency that the families she evaluates say they are never afforded. Most concerning to these parents is the ongoing pattern in which she appears to be alienating her own children from their father, even as she positions herself publicly as an authority on preventing alienation to sell her court ordered services.

PERJURY EXPOSED IN COURT FILINGS

As scrutiny over Kristyn Alcott's professional conduct grew, a thorough examination of her own family-court filings revealed a troubling pattern of financial inconsistencies. Alcott's Motions to Modify or Enforce Child Support and Affidavits of Financial Information (AFI) present a financial picture that appears inconsistent with other documents she filed under penalty of perjury.

Public records show that the expenses Alcott reported far exceeded the income she claimed, raising immediate concerns about how she was able to maintain her lifestyle and pay substantial legal fees. Her tax returns and profit-and-loss statements reflect significantly higher

earnings than the income reported to the court. Her vehicle financing application at Camelback Kia reported yet another income figure, compounding the allegations of fraud and her willingness to lie under oath.

These contradictions go beyond simple oversight. The discrepancies are so substantial that they cannot reasonably be dismissed as clerical error. In one example, Alcott's personal attorney fees for the year exceeded the total income she swore to. That gap is mathematically impossible to reconcile without acknowledging that at least one set of filings is inaccurate. It appears these intentional misrepresentations have allowed her to fraudulently obtain child-support orders.

When viewed together, the conflicting financial statements point to a wide range of misconduct. These include alleged perjury, fraud on the court, loan-application fraud, false statements to a financial institution, fraudulent misrepresentation in a credit application, fabrication or alteration of financial records, and multiple tax-related violations. The fact that she reported different income figures across sworn court documents, tax filings, and consumer-finance applications has only intensified public concern about the accuracy of her disclosures and her willingness to knowingly provide false information under oath.

Many filings we reviewed in Alcott's case appear to fall under Arizona Revised Statutes §13-2702, which defines perjury as a Class 4 felony, and they may constitute fraud on the court. If so, the impact could extend beyond her own child-support orders and potentially affect Federal Title IV-D child-support disbursements. Her ex-husband has strong grounds to seek vacatur of previous orders obtained through this deception, exposing Alcott to sanctions, repayment obligations, civil and criminal liability.

Regrettably, the allegations surrounding Alcott's personal conduct mirror the same pattern of bias and misrepresentation that parents say they experienced in her professional work. Her willingness to distort facts in her own court filings for personal advantage raises serious doubts about her capacity to make impartial, child-centered decisions when supervising or evaluating custody and visitation cases. That concern is only heightened by the number of parents who report that she provided inaccurate or misleading information in court-ordered reports and while testifying. To these families, the pattern is unmistakable: Alcott appears willing to go to extraordinary lengths for financial gain, including allegedly falsifying information to secure child-support orders—behavior that directly contradicts the standards she claims to uphold in the cases she oversees.

The gap between Kristyn Alcott's public testimony and her own family-court history has become a central point of concern for parents and advocates. While she has urged lawmakers

to treat parental alienation as a serious form of emotional abuse, records show that Alcott has prohibited her child from seeing their father for many months without evidence that would justify such restrictions. For families who depend on court-appointed professionals to act with neutrality and integrity, this contrast creates the appearance of a double standard and raises uncomfortable questions about whether Alcott's personal conduct mirrors the very patterns of alienation she warns others about.

Across Alcott's professional and personal history, an unmistakable pattern emerges, one that continually returns to fractured relationships with fathers and paternal figures. Her own father testified against her during her divorce. Her long and bitter conflict with the father of her child has unfolded through years of accusations, police involvement, and relentless courtroom battles. Then she revealed a "*Daddy's Girl*" tattoo, a choice many parents describe as startling and even provocative for someone who holds authority over fathers in custody disputes. Taken together, these elements form a troubling picture that raises serious questions about whether her personal struggles with paternal relationships are influencing her professional judgment in family court. Families are left asking how someone with such a charged and complicated history around fathers can be trusted to shape decisions that determine the fate of fathers and their children.

ARIZONA LICENSING BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL HEALTH FUELS FRAUD WITH SPECIAL TREATMENT

The **Arizona Board of Behavioral Health** granted Kristyn Alcott a **temporary license** in November 2025 despite documented unlicensed practice, fabricated credentials, and impersonation as a social worker. New court appointments followed immediately, suggesting obvious special treatment.

A WEB OF CONNECTIONS AND PROTECTION

Public records and long-standing professional ties show that Kristyn Alcott does not operate alone. Her continued presence in high-conflict custody cases despite mounting controversies is possible only because she is embedded in a tight, insular network of professionals who dominate Arizona's family-court ecosystem. This article sheds light on only a few of her connections that have shielded her from accountability despite mounting concerns and the State of Arizona's growing liability.

The concerns surrounding these relationship extend far beyond bias and undisclosed conflicts. The network surrounding these professionals creates a serious data-security and privacy risk for families involved in Maricopa County custody cases. Court-appointed supervisors, evaluators, and behavioral-health providers routinely receive access to psychological evaluations, financial disclosures, medical records, school records, therapy notes, police reports, DCS records, and personal identifying information including social security numbers of parents and children.

In a properly functioning system, this information would be safeguarded by strict confidentiality rules. But the closed-loop referral network operating inside the Maricopa County court system has created conditions where litigants' most sensitive data may be accessible—directly or indirectly—to individuals with histories of fraud, ethical violations, or even criminal convictions. Public records show that numerous court-appointed providers, attorneys, and even judges have faced judgments, tax liens, or other financial red flags, deepening concerns about who ultimately has access to families' private information.

The following disclosures represent only the first layer of the closed loop referral network that has infiltrated the Maricopa County Family Court—a full exposé of the remaining connections will follow.

KRISTYN ALCOTT AND RONN LAVIT

Alcott previously worked for Ronn Lavit, a longtime figure in Arizona's court network. Lavit has been involved in countless custody cases over several decades, and his influence within the system has helped protect those within his professional orbit. Despite numerous complaints filed against behavioral-health providers connected to Lavit, public records show that disciplinary action is rare—a pattern that reflects the power of the network rather than the merits of the complaints. Alcott's prior employment with **Ronn Lavit**—who shares mutual addresses and business interests with board member **Jose Luis Madera, LPC**—raises serious questions about insider connections shielding her from accountability.

KRISTYN ALCOTT AND RICK KILFOY

Another major point of scrutiny is **Kristyn Alcott's reported work as an investigator for attorney Rick Kilfoy**, a relationship that has not been disclosed in cases where both have appeared. This lack of transparency is especially troubling given that **Kilfoy has faced recent**

disciplinary action from the Arizona State Bar and has been referenced in news coverage involving allegations of professional misconduct.

Public records add another layer of concern. Law-enforcement reports show that Alcott **repeatedly left her 13-year-old daughter overnight at the home of Rick Kilfoy**, unsupervised.

Despite their overlapping involvement in family-court matters, **neither Alcott nor Kilfoy have disclosed their professional relationship** to the litigants whose cases they influence. Parents say this omission is not a minor oversight but a **material conflict of interest**, especially when the two have referred clients to one another or appeared in the same cases.

KRISTYN ALCOTT AND DR. CELICE KORSTEN

Perhaps the most controversial connection involves Alcott's role as a **gestational surrogate for Dr. Celice Korsten**, a psychologist whose evaluations are frequently used in Maricopa County custody cases. This intimate relationship creates a direct conflict of interest in the cases where both women appear—a conflict that has never been disclosed to the families whose lives they influence.

Dr. Korsten, owner of Envision Psychological Services PLLC and a psychologist whose evaluations are routinely used in Maricopa County custody disputes, conducts psychological and psychosexual assessments that can cost more than $10,000. These evaluations often result in recommendations for supervised parenting time—a service Alcott provides at hourly rates between $60 and $400. This dynamic creates an inherent financial incentive: Korsten's evaluations produce supervision orders, and Alcott directly benefits from carrying them out.

The concern is not hypothetical. Parents who have reviewed case files say that Korsten and Alcott have appeared in the same cases, issuing reports and recommendations that reinforce one another—without ever disclosing their surrogacy relationship. Critics describe this as a self-reinforcing evidence loop, where one professional's conclusions bolster the other's, shaping custody outcomes behind a veil of secrecy. These undisclosed ties have fueled allegations of bias, conflict of interest, and even fraudulent concealment. Failing to disclose such a significant personal relationship violates the ethical standards expected of court-appointed professionals and deprives litigants of the ability to challenge potential bias.

Dr. Celice Korsten, PsyD, often presented in Maricopa County courts as a neutral evaluator, is **no stranger to controversy**. While her professional reports carry enormous weight in custody

cases, public records surrounding her household tell a far more complicated story—one that critics argue raises serious questions about judgment, transparency, and financial entanglements.

Much of the scrutiny centers on her former spouse, **Brandon Lederer**, whose extensive legal and regulatory history is well-documented. Public records show that Lederer has been tied to a series of fraudulent business ventures—including Express Flooring, Healthy Home Flooring, Express Home Services, and Home Lift Now LLC—that have faced significant legal action. His record includes:

- **A Maricopa County theft conviction (CR2018-006675)**
- **An Arizona Attorney General settlement**
- **Multiple six-figure civil judgments**
- **A state-issued cease-and-desist order directing him to halt business operations**

Despite these sanctions, Lederer continued to operate new companies, involving Korsten's family members. This pattern suggests a deliberate effort to keep business activity alive despite state enforcement actions. The couple's divorce, while legally documented, appears to be a sham designed to shield Korsten from Lederer's mounting liabilities. Lederer remains active in multiple ventures connected to Korsten's family even after the divorce, and that financial benefits continued to flow into Korsten's household.

Real-estate records add yet another layer of concern. In addition to her other property, Korsten purchased a $1.65 million home with an $870,000 down payment—a figure that is difficult to reconcile with the income of a court-appointed provider who also has multiple six-figure judgments against her. The discrepancy has fueled questions about whether funds connected to Lederer-linked ventures may have helped finance the purchase.
This network of overlapping professional, personal, and financial relationships has created a system where insiders are insulated from consequences. This is why dozens of serious complaints against behavioral health operatives embedded in Maricopa County courts have gone unpunished, despite allegations of ethical violations, conflicts of interest, and misconduct.

To parents who have been pulled into this system, the pattern feels impossible to ignore: **the network protects its own**. They argue that Alcott's steady stream of court appointments—even after public scandals, police reports, and widespread criticism—is not an accident or oversight, but a symptom of a deeper structural failure. In their view, the same network that helped elevate her has also shielded her, and the state's unwillingness to intervene has allowed the situation to grow into a serious legal liability for Arizona.

The mounting frustration has reached a breaking point. Parents across Maricopa County are now organizing a class-action lawsuit, arguing that the systemic failures surrounding Alcott and the broader referral network have harmed families, violated due-process rights, and placed children at unnecessary risk. **Case after case highlights the systemic violations of constitutional rights**—including due-process violations, negligence, and interference with the fundamental right to parent one's child.

Parents emphasize that the lawsuit is not about a single supervisor. It targets an entire system that has enabled misconduct by refusing to enforce basic standards of transparency, oversight, and accountability, allowing the court and its appointees to flagrantly violate the law and trample the constitutional rights of both parents and children.

The financial entanglements deepen the concern surrounding the closed-loop referral system, where evaluations, recommendations, and supervision orders circulate among the same small group of insiders. They say this structure allows professionals to profit from one another's decisions while families are left unaware of the relationships shaping their cases.

If concerns about Alcott's conduct continue to accumulate, the fallout will not be limited to her alone. Her ongoing involvement in court-ordered cases will eventually force the Arizona Board of Behavioral Health Examiners and her oversight supervisor to address the expanding record of complaints. Whether the response comes in the form of license revocation, disciplinary action, or legislative reform, the system will ultimately have to confront the consequences of protecting an alleged mentally unstable con-artist whose conduct has now drawn national attention.

A more detailed exposé identifying the individuals involved will follow.

This work is released under the CC0 1.0 Universal Public Domain Dedication. You are free to copy, modify, distribute, syndicate, or build upon this material for any purpose, without permission or attribution.